UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,323	03/22/2007	Pier John Anthony Sazio	DYOUP0313US	7470
	23908 7590 01/04/2011 RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP 1621 EUCLID AVENUE	EXAMINER		
1621 EUCLID AVENUE			FLETCHER III, WILLIAM P	
NINETEENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44115			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1715	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/04/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/595,323	SAZIO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	William P. Fletcher III	1715			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 Seconds</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the practice of the prac	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8 and 36 is/are withdered. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7,9-35 and 37-54 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	rawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 April 2006 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/7/06, 5/8/06, 5/24/07, 3/2/10.	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) ☐ Notice of Informal P 6) ☐ Other:	ute			

Application/Control Number: 10/595,323 Page 2

Art Unit: 1715

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-7, 9-35, and 37-54, in the reply filed on 30 September 2010 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7 April 2006, 8 May 2006, 24 May 2007, and 2 March 2010 have been considered by the Primary Examiner.

Drawings

3. The drawings were received on 7 April 2010. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 1-7, 9-35, and 37-54, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - A. The terms *elongate* and *substantially the length of the sample* are relative terms and it is unclear just how elongate or how long the voids must be in order to meet these limitations. As such, the metes and bounds of the claim are impossible to determine.

Application/Control Number: 10/595,323 Page 3

Art Unit: 1715

B. In claims 20-52, the term *functional material* lacks antecedent basis. The independent claim recite a semiconductor material.

Double Patenting

6. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 7. Claims 1-5, 9-12, 32-35, 37, 38, and 40-45, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-5, 8-11, 21-24, 26, 27, 29-33, and 35, of prior U.S. Patent No. 7,799,663 B2. This is a double patenting rejection.
- 8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 6, 7, 14-18, 23, and 39, are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6, 12-15, 20, and 28, of U.S. Patent No. 7,799,663 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter of the instant claims is fully encompassed by the subject matter of the copending claims such that in performing the process of the instant claims, one necessarily performs the process of the patented claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Fletcher III whose telephone number is (571)

Application/Control Number: 10/595,323 Page 5

Art Unit: 1715

272-1419. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 AM

- 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Phillip Fletcher III/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1715

3 January 2011